

Preprint No. M 12/14

**Stabilization of linear time-varying
systems**

Brian D.O. Anderson, Achim Ilchmann and
Fabian R. Wirth

2012

Impressum:

Hrsg.: Leiter des Instituts für Mathematik
Weimarer Straße 25
98693 Ilmenau

Tel.: +49 3677 69-3621

Fax: +49 3677 69-3270

<http://www.tu-ilmenau.de/math/>

Stabilizability of linear time-varying systems

Brian D.O. Anderson^{1,1}, Achim Ilchmann^{b,2}, Fabian R. Wirth^{c,3}

^a*Research School of Engineering, The Australian National University, Canberra 0200, Australia*

^b*Institut für Mathematik, Technische Universität Ilmenau, Weimarer Straße 25, D-98693 Ilmenau, Germany*

^c*Institut für Mathematik, Universität Würzburg, Emil-Fischer-Straße 40, D-97074 Würzburg, Germany*

Abstract

For linear time-varying systems with bounded system matrices we discuss the problem of stabilizability by linear state feedback. It is shown that an optimal control approach yields a criterion in terms of the cost for stabilizability. The constants appearing in the criterion of optimality allow for the distinction of exponential and uniform exponential stabilizability. We show that the system is completely controllable if, and only if, the Lyapunov exponent is arbitrarily assignable by a suitable feedback. For uniform exponential stabilizability and the assignability of the Bohl exponent this property is known. Also, dynamic feedback does not provide more freedom to address the stabilization problem.

Keywords: Linear time-varying system, feedback stabilization, Lyapunov exponent, Bohl exponent, quadratic optimal control, Riccati equation

2000 MSC: 93D15,

2000 MSC: 34H15

Nomenclature

$\ x\ $	$= \sqrt{x^\top x}$, the Euclidean norm of $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$
$L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; \mathbb{R}^{n \times m})$	the set essentially bounded $f : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$
$L^\infty_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; \mathbb{R}^{n \times m})$	the set $f : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, such that on any compact interval $I \subset \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, the restriction $f_I \in L^\infty(I; \mathbb{R}^{n \times m})$.
$L^2(I; \mathbb{R}^m)$	the set of integrable functions $f : I \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$, $I \subset \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ an interval, such that $\int_I \ f(\tau)\ ^2 d\tau < \infty$.

Email addresses: brian.anderson@anu.edu.au (Brian D.O. Anderson), achim.ilchmann@tu-ilmenau.de (Achim Ilchmann), wirth@mathematik.uni-wuerzburg.de (Fabian R. Wirth)

¹Work supported by Australian Research Council under DP-110100538.

²Work supported by German Research Foundation under Wi1458/10

³Work supported by German Research Foundation under Il29/14

1. Introduction

We consider the linear, time-varying system

$$\dot{x}(t) = A(t)x(t) + B(t)u(t), \quad x(t_0) = x^0 \quad (1.1)$$

for measurable and essentially bounded $A : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $B : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$, piecewise continuous input function $u : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^m$, and initial data $(t_0, x^0) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}^n$. Unbounded $A(\cdot)$ and $B(\cdot)$ are only considered in Remark 3.11. The unique and global solution of (1.1) corresponding to the initial condition $(t_0, x^0) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}^n$ and the input $u(\cdot)$ is denoted by $x(\cdot; t_0, x^0, u) : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$.

For the homogeneous system

$$\dot{x}(t) = A(t)x(t), \quad x(t_0) = x^0 \quad (1.2)$$

with measurable and essentially bounded $A : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, the unique solution is denoted by $x(\cdot; t_0, x^0) : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ and its transition matrix by $\Phi_A(\cdot, \cdot)$. It is well known, that $\Phi_A(\cdot, t_0)$ is obtained as the unique solution of the initial value problem $\dot{\Phi}(\cdot, t_0) = A(\cdot)\Phi(\cdot, t_0)$, $\Phi(t_0, t_0) = I_n$.

In this paper we study the problem of defining conditions under which the system (1.1) is stabilizable by bounded or locally bounded state feedback. In the linear time-invariant case the characterization of stabilizability is well known: the uncontrollable part of the pair (A, B) has to be exponentially stable. In particular, controllability implies stabilizability. In fact, for controllable time-invariant systems it is possible to achieve, by constant static linear feedback, arbitrary exponential decay rates of the closed-loop system.

In the time-varying case problems arise because now there are distinct notions of stability. The strongest of these is uniform asymptotic or, equivalently, uniform exponential stability. This notion corresponds well to uniform controllability, and Ikeda, Maeda and Kodama [1, 2] proved among other things the analogue of the time-invariant statement: assuming boundedness of $(A(\cdot), B(\cdot))$ system (1.1) is uniformly controllable if, and only if, it is uniformly exponentially stabilizable by bounded feedback with arbitrary prespecified decay; see [1, Theorem 3]. We note that the ‘only if’ part of the result is set up as a problem in [3, Problem 14.2-1], based on arguing that if $(A(\cdot), B(\cdot))$ is uniformly controllable then so is $(A(\cdot) + \alpha I, B(\cdot))$ for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$.

For bounded $(A(\cdot), B(\cdot))$, Ravi, Pascoal and Khargonekar prove in their result [4, Lemma 3.3] that uniform exponential stabilizability (not necessarily with arbitrary decay) is equivalent to the existence of a bounded symmetric positive semidefinite solution $P[\cdot]$ to the control Riccati equation

$$\frac{d}{dt} \Pi(t) = -A(t)^\top \Pi(t) - \Pi(t)A(t) + \Pi(t)B(t)B(t)^\top \Pi(t) - I_n \quad \text{on } (t_0, \infty). \quad (1.3)$$

In this case, the closed-loop system $\dot{x} = [A - BB^\top P]x$ is uniformly exponentially stable. We note that while in [4] only the necessity of the solvability is proved, the sufficiency is straightforward using the arguments provided in [4].

Finally, concerning uniform exponential stabilizability, Rotea and Khargonekar [5] prove that dynamic feedback does not provide more freedom in

the sense that if (1.1) is uniformly exponentially stabilizable by dynamic linear feedback, then the same can be achieved by static, time-varying linear feedback.

If we consider merely exponential stability, not necessarily uniform, the picture is not quite as well studied. Ikeda et al. [1] have shown that exponential stabilization with arbitrary time-varying decay (see Remark 3.11 of the present note) is equivalent to complete controllability, even systems with unbounded data $(A(\cdot), B(\cdot))$. The relation of exponential stabilizability to solutions of the Riccati equation is less well studied and the result similar to [5] is missing.

In the recent paper by Phat and Ha [6] the authors consistently consider the initial time $t_0 = 0$, which fails to capture the issue of uniformity. In [6] the notion of global null controllability is introduced, which is what is called controllability at time $t_0 = 0$ in the present paper, see Section 2.2. It is claimed in [6, Theorem 3.1] that global null controllability is equivalent to complete stabilizability and to the existence of a bounded symmetric positive semidefinite solution of the Riccati equation (1.3). This is incorrect as we show in Example 3.7 below. However, a easy example is immediate: It is clear that

$$\dot{x} = x + b(t)u, \quad \text{where } b(t) = 1 \text{ for } t \in [0, 1], \quad b(t) = 0 \text{ for } t > 1$$

is controllable at $t_0 = 0$, but not stabilizable by bounded linear feedback, as $b(\cdot)$ vanishes after $t = 1$. Moreover, the corresponding Riccati equation $\dot{p}(t) + 2p(t) - b(t)p(t)^2 + 1 = 0$ does not have bounded positive solutions on $[0, \infty)$: After $t = 1$ the equation becomes linear and any solution of $\dot{p}(t) = -2p(t) - 1$, $t \geq 1$, tends to $-1/2$ as t goes to infinity. Therefore a positive solution does not exist.

In this paper we extend the existing theory in several directions:

(i) We give a characterization of stabilizability in terms of the optimal controllability property (A1). This complements existing characterizations of uniform exponential stabilizability using the solvability of Riccati equations and gives rise to a sufficient criterion (A2) for exponential stabilizability.

(ii) We extend [1, Theorem 1]. In particular, it is shown that for bounded $(A(\cdot), B(\cdot))$ complete controllability is equivalent to the fact that using (possibly unbounded) feedback the maximal Lyapunov exponent of the system may be assigned to be bounded by any prespecified constant.

(iii) Concerning the question of dynamic feedback, we provide an alternative proof for the result of [5] for the case of uniform exponential stabilizability and show that a similar statement is true for exponential stabilizability.

In view of the various concepts of controllability and stabilizability defined in Sections 2.2 and 2.3, resp., we show the following:




Figure 1: For each unidirectional implication, there is a counterexample demonstrating it is not bidirectional. Details in text clarify boundedness assumptions, which are sometimes but not always required.

The presentation frequently recalls familiar definitions and results in an effort to make the paper self-contained. The paper is organized as follows: In Section 2 we recall the standard definitions of stability, the characterizations of exponential stability via Lyapunov and Bohl exponents, definitions relating to controllability, provide definitions of stabilizability, introduce relevant Lyapunov and Riccati equations and formulate an optimal control problem. Section 3 contains the main contributions of the paper. In Section 3.1 we introduce the notion of L^2 -optimizability, give some characterizations and show that L^2 -optimizability implies asymptotic stabilizability using the associated Riccati equation as an intermediate tool. In Theorem 3.6 we show that in the bounded case complete controllability is equivalent to the assignability of arbitrary Lyapunov exponents. Two examples are provided with one discussing the claims of [6] and a further one discussing the relation of bounded exponential stabilizability and uniform exponential stabilizability. In Section 3.2 the notion of L^2 -optimizability is strengthened and it is shown that this yields a characterization of exponential stabilizability. In Section 4 we provide a new proof for the result of Rotea and Khargonekar and show a similar statement for the case of exponential stabilization.

2. Preliminaries

In the present section we collect definitions of well-known concepts and their characterizations; they will be used in Section 3 and 4.

2.1. Stability, Lyapunov exponents, and Bohl exponents

We are interested in the stabilization of system (1.1). We briefly recall several distinct notions of stability. The zero solution of System (1.2) is called

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{attractive} & :\iff \forall t_0 \geq 0 \forall x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n : \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} x(t; t_0, x^0) = 0 \\
\text{stable} & :\iff \forall \varepsilon > 0 \forall t_0 \geq 0 \exists \delta > 0 \forall x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n \text{ s.t. } \|x_0\| < \delta \\
& \quad \forall t \geq t_0 : \|x(t; t_0, x^0)\| < \varepsilon \\
\text{asymptotically stable} & :\iff (1.2) \text{ is attractive and stable} \\
\text{exponentially stable} & :\iff \exists M \geq 1 \exists \beta > 0 \forall t \geq 0 : \|\Phi_A(t, 0)\| \leq M e^{-\beta t} \\
\text{uniformly exp. stable} & :\iff \exists M \geq 1 \exists \beta > 0 \forall t \geq t_0 \geq 0 \\
& \quad : \|\Phi_A(t, t_0)\| \leq M e^{-\beta(t-t_0)}.
\end{aligned}$$

It is well-known, see for example [7, Prop. 3.3.2], that for linear systems attractiveness of (1.2) implies asymptotic stability. Also, uniform exponential stability implies exponential stability, which in turn implies asymptotic stability. The converse of the latter statements is false.

The concepts regarding exponential stability can be characterized in terms of the *Lyapunov exponent*, defined by

$$k_L(A) := \inf \{ \omega \in \mathbb{R} \mid \exists M_\omega \geq 0 \forall t \geq 0 : \|\Phi_A(t, 0)\| \leq M_\omega e^{\omega t} \} \in \mathbb{R}.$$

We then have that (1.2) is exponentially stable, if, and only if, $k_L(A) < 0$. The *Bohl exponent* is defined by

$$k_B(A) := \inf \{ \omega \in \mathbb{R} \mid \exists M_\omega \geq 0 \forall t \geq t_0 \geq 0 : \|\Phi_A(t, t_0)\| \leq M_\omega e^{\omega(t-t_0)} \} \in \mathbb{R};$$

it gives rise to the characterization

$$(1.2) \text{ is uniformly exponentially stable} \iff k_B(A) < 0. \quad (2.1)$$

See Daleckiĭ and Kreĭn [8, Sect. III.4] and Hinrichsen and Pritchard [7, Sect. 3.3]; there you also find that Lyapunov and Bohl exponent are finite if A is bounded.

2.2. Controllability

Kalman [9] introduced the following notions: System (1.1) is called

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{controllable at } t_0 \geq 0 & :\iff \forall x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n \exists t_1 \geq t_0 \exists u \in L^2([t_0, t_1]; \mathbb{R}^m) \\
& \quad : x(t_1; t_0, x^0, u) = 0 \\
\text{completely controllable} & :\iff \forall (t_0, x^0) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}^n \exists t_1 \geq t_0 \exists u \in L^2([t_0, t_1]; \mathbb{R}^m) \\
& \quad : x(t_1; t_0, x^0, u) = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

These concepts can be characterized (see Kalman [9, Prop. (5.2)]) in terms of the *controllability Gramian* defined by

$$W(t_0, t_1) := \int_{t_0}^{t_1} \Phi_A(t_0, s) B(s) B(s)^\top \Phi_A(t_0, s)^\top ds, \quad t_1 \geq t_0 \geq 0 \quad (2.2)$$

as follows:

$$(1.1) \text{ is controllable at } t_0 \iff \exists t_1 \geq t_0 : W(t_0, t_1) \succ 0$$

$$(1.1) \text{ is completely controllable} \iff \forall t_0 \geq 0 \exists t_1 \geq t_0 : W(t_0, t_1) \succ 0.$$

The latter leads to the more restrictive notion of *uniform controllability* of (1.1); see Kalman [9, Def. (5.13)]. In our case, where $A(\cdot), B(\cdot)$ are bounded, this may be formulated as

$$\exists \alpha_1, \alpha_2, T > 0 \forall t \geq 0 : \alpha_1 I_n \prec W(t, t+T) \prec \alpha_2 I_n. \quad (2.3)$$

Note that the inequality on the right hand side is automatic because of the assumed boundedness of $A(\cdot)$ and $B(\cdot)$.

Cheng [10] (see also Rugh [11, p. 261]) introduced the *weighted controllability Gramian* as a tool for the stabilization problem. It is defined by

$$W_\alpha(t_0, t_1) := \int_{t_0}^{t_1} e^{4\alpha(t_0-s)} \Phi_A(t_0, s) B(s) B(s)^\top \Phi_A(t_0, s)^\top ds, \quad t_1 \geq t_0 \geq 0, \alpha > 0, \quad (2.4)$$

and is seen to be the controllability Gramian of $\dot{x} = [A(t) + 2\alpha I]x + B(t)u$.

2.3. Stabilizability

We now introduce the main concepts of stabilizability under investigation; they all correspond to a notion of stability. In particular, we call (1.1)

asymptotically stabilizable $:\iff \exists F \in L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}) : \dot{x} = [A + BF]x$ is asymp. stable,

exponentially stabilizable $:\iff \exists \alpha > 0 \exists F \in L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}) : k_L(A + BF) < -\alpha,$

uniformly exponentially stabilizable $:\iff \exists \alpha > 0 \exists F \in L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}) : k_B(A + BF) < -\alpha.$

In case that in any of the above we may choose $F \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; \mathbb{R}^{m \times n})$, we say that the system may be (*exponentially etc.*) *stabilized by bounded feedback*.

Complete controllability and uniform controllability are frequently brought into relation with the notion of *complete stabilizability*. The first use of this term appears to be in the paper of Ikeda et al. [1]. For time-invariant systems this is frequently understood as the possibility to assign arbitrary decay rates (and this is indeed the problem studied in [12]). For time-varying system the very general definition of [1] is discussed in Remark 3.11.

2.4. Stabilizability versus controllability

Ikeda et al. [1, Theorem 3] have shown for bounded $(A(\cdot), B(\cdot))$ that

$$(1.1) \text{ is uniformly controllable} \iff \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{R} \exists F \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}) : k_B(A + BF) < -\alpha.$$

A more constructive version with the aid of (2.4) is by Cheng [10], see also Rugh [11, Th. 14.7]:

$$(1.1) \text{ is unif. contr., } T \text{ as in (2.3)} \implies \forall \alpha > 0 : k_B(A - BB^\top W_\alpha(t, t+T)^{-1}) < -\alpha.$$

2.5. Optimal control

To study the stabilization problem, we consider, for system (1.1) with initial data $(t_0, x^0) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}^n$ and control input $u \in L^2([t_0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^m)$, the *finite-time cost on $[t_0, t_1]$*

$$J(t_1; t_0, x^0, u) := \int_{t_0}^{t_1} [\|x(\tau; t_0, x^0, u)\|^2 + \|u(\tau)\|^2] d\tau, \quad (2.5)$$

and the *infinite-time cost on $[t_0, \infty)$*

$$J(\infty; t_0, x^0, u) := \int_{t_0}^{\infty} [\|x(\tau; t_0, x^0, u)\|^2 + \|u(\tau)\|^2] d\tau \in [0, \infty]. \quad (2.6)$$

The *value function* associated to (2.5) is given by

$$V(t_1; t_0, x^0) := \inf_{u \in L^2(t_0, t_1)} J(t_1; t_0, x^0, u) \quad (2.7)$$

In the following proposition we summarize some of the well-known properties of the relationship between the optimal control problem and the differential Riccati equation

$$\boxed{\frac{d}{dt}P(t) = -A(t)^\top P(t) - P(t)A(t) + P(t)B(t)B(t)^\top P(t) - I_n}. \quad (2.8)$$

Proposition 2.1. [13, Theorem 37, p. 364]

Consider system (1.1) on the interval $[t_0, t_1]$ for $0 \leq t_0 \leq t_1 < \infty$. Then the differential Riccati equation (2.8) with final condition $P(t_1) = 0$ has a unique symmetric solution

$$P(\cdot; t_1, t_0) : [t_0, t_1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}.$$

This solution has the following properties:

(i) *The feedback*

$$u(t) = -B(t)^\top P(t; t_1, t_0)$$

yields, for all $x^0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the unique optimal solution $(u(\cdot), x(\cdot; t_0, x^0, u))$ to the problem (2.5), (2.7).

$$(ii) \quad \forall t' \in [t_0, t_1] \quad \forall x^0 \in \mathbb{R}^n : V(t_1; t', x^0) = (x^0)^\top P(t'; t_1, t_0) x^0. \quad (2.9)$$

(iii) *In view of (ii) and (2.5),*

$$\forall t \in [t_0, t_1] : P(t; t_1, t_0) > 0.$$

(iv) *From (2.9) we conclude: $\forall t_0 \leq t \leq t_1 < t_2 : P(t; t_1, t_0) \leq P(t; t_2, t_0)$.*

3. Controllability, stabilizability, and optimal control

In this section we derive, in terms of the cost, a sufficient condition for asymptotic stabilizability and also show that system (1.1) is completely controllable if, and only if, the Lyapunov exponent is arbitrarily assignable by a suitable feedback. We then concentrate on uniform exponential stabilizability and show that a strengthened condition in terms of the cost holds if, and only if, the Bohl exponent is arbitrarily assignable by a suitable feedback.

3.1. Stabilizability

We begin our discussion of the stabilization problem by introducing a condition for the infinite time cost that can be achieved for the optimal control problem (2.6). This criterion turns out to be already close to stabilizability.

Consider system (1.1). The following bound is essential in our setup

$$(A1) \quad \forall t_0 \geq 0 \exists C(t_0) \geq 0 \quad \forall x^0 \in \mathbb{R}^n \exists u \in L^2([t_0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^m) \\ : J(\infty; t_0, x^0, u) \leq C(t_0) \|x^0\|^2.$$

The concept introduced in (A1) is closely related to what has been called “optimizable” in an infinite-dimensional context. Indeed, the equivalent notion (A1') defined below is exactly this concept as introduced in [14].

Proposition 3.1. *Consider system (1.1). Then the following assumptions are each equivalent to (A1):*

$$(A1') \quad \forall (t_0, x^0) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}^n \exists u \in L^2([t_0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^m) : J(\infty; t_0, x^0, u) < \infty;$$

$$(A1'') \quad \forall (t_0, x^0) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}^n \exists u \in L^2([t_0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^m) \\ : x \in L^2([t_0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^n) \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} x(t; t_0, x^0, u) = 0.$$

Proof. The implications (A1) \Rightarrow (A1') and (A1'') \Rightarrow (A1') are trivial.
(A1') \Rightarrow (A1) : Let $(t_0, x^0) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}^n$ and set

$$x^0 = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^0 e_i \quad \text{for the canonical vectors } e_1, \dots, e_n \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Then Assumption (A1') yields

$$\forall i = 1, \dots, n \exists u_i \in L^2([t_0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^m) : J(\infty; t_0, e_i, u_i) < \infty.$$

Now by linearity of (1.1) we conclude, for $u(\cdot) := \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^0 u_i(\cdot)$, that

$$\begin{aligned} x(t; t_0, x^0, u) &= \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^0 \left[\Phi(t, t_0) e_i + \int_{t_0}^t \Phi(t, \tau) B(\tau) u_i(\tau) d\tau \right] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^0 x(t; t_0, e_i, u_i) \end{aligned}$$

and therefore we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} J(\infty; t_0, x^0, u) &\stackrel{(2.6)}{=} \int_{t_0}^{\infty} [\|x(\tau; t_0, x^0, u)\|^2 + \|u(\tau)\|^2] d\tau \\ &= \int_{t_0}^{\infty} \left[\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^0 x(t; t_0, e_i, u_i) \right\|^2 + \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^0 u_i(\tau) \right\|^2 \right] d\tau \\ &\leq n \max_{i \in \{1, \dots, n\}} |x_i^0|^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{t_0}^{\infty} [\|x(t; t_0, e_i, u_i)\|^2 + \|u_i(\tau)\|^2] d\tau \\ &\leq n \sum_{i=1}^n J(\infty; t_0, e_i, u_i) \|x^0\|^2 =: C(t_0) \|x^0\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

(A1') \Rightarrow (A1'') : If $J(\infty; t_0, x^0, u) < \infty$, then $x \in L^2([t_0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^n)$, $u \in L^2([t_0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^m)$, and by boundedness of $A(\cdot), B(\cdot)$ we have

$$\dot{x}(\cdot) = A(\cdot) x(\cdot) + B(\cdot) u(\cdot) \in L^2([t_0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^n).$$

This implies $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} x(t) = 0$ by Barbălat's lemma, see e.g. [7, Lemma 2.3.9]. The proof is complete. \square

The next theorem is the first main result of the present paper: We derive a sufficient criterion for asymptotic stabilizability, see (A1''), based on the optimal controllability property (A1).

Theorem 3.2. *Consider system (1.1) and suppose that (A1) holds. Then we*

have the implications (A1) \implies (3.1) \implies (3.2) \implies (3.3) with

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \exists \text{ a function } \gamma : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty) : \forall 0 \leq t_0 < t_1 \leq \infty \forall x^0 \in \mathbb{R}^n \\ \gamma(t_1 - t_0) \|x^0\|^2 \leq V(t_1; t_0, x^0) \leq C(t_0) \|x^0\|^2 \end{aligned} \right\} (3.1)$$

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \forall t_0 \geq 0 \exists \text{ solution } \Pi(\cdot, t_0) : [t_0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} \text{ of (2.8) with initial condition } \Pi(t_0, t_0) := \lim_{t_1 \rightarrow \infty} P(t_0; t_1, t_0), \text{ where } P(\cdot; t_1, t_0) \text{ is from Theorem 2.1 and this solution is unique, symmetric and positive definite for all } t \geq t_0; \text{ further, for all } t \geq t_0, \Pi(t, t_0) = \lim_{t_1 \rightarrow \infty} P(t; t_1, t_0). \end{aligned} \right\} (3.2)$$

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \text{With } \Pi(\cdot) := \Pi(\cdot, t_0) \text{ as defined in (3.2), the closed-loop system} \\ \dot{x} = [A - BB^\top \Pi] x \\ \text{is asymptotically stable. In particular, } B(\cdot)^\top \Pi(\cdot) \in L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}). \end{aligned} \right\} (3.3)$$

For the proof of Theorem 3.2, we record the following lemma; a proof of it can be found, for example, in [7, Lemma 3.3.4].

Lemma 3.3. *The transition matrix of the homogeneous system (1.2) satisfies, for $a := \|A\|_{L^\infty(0, \infty)}$, and all $0 \leq s \leq t$*

$$e^{-a(t-s)} \leq \|\Phi_A(t, s)\| \leq e^{a(t-s)} \quad \wedge \quad e^{-a(t-s)} \leq \|\Phi_A(s, t)\|^{-1} \leq e^{a(t-s)}. \quad (3.4)$$

Proof of Theorem 3.2.

(A1) \implies (3.1) : For $x^0 = 0$ there is nothing to show, so assume $x^0 \neq 0$. Set $a := \|A\|_{L^\infty(0, \infty)}$, $b := \|B\|_{L^\infty(0, \infty)}$. We derive, for all $t \in [t_0, t_1]$ and all $u \in L^2([t_0, t_1]; \mathbb{R}^m)$, and in view of the convolution inequality [7, Prop. A.3.14],

$$\begin{aligned} \|x(t; t_0, x^0, u)\| &\geq \|\Phi(t, t_0) x^0\| - \left\| \int_{t_0}^t \Phi(t, \tau) B(\tau) u(\tau) d\tau \right\| \\ &\stackrel{(3.4)}{\geq} e^{-a(t-t_0)} \|x^0\| - \int_{t_0}^t e^{a[t-\tau]} b \|u(\tau)\| d\tau \\ &\geq e^{-a(t-t_0)} \|x^0\| - b \|e^{a\cdot}\|_{L^1(0, t-t_0)} \|u\|_{L^2(t_0, t)} \\ &=: \Lambda(t - t_0, u) \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

Note that $\Lambda(r, u)$ is strictly decreasing in $r > 0$. Define

$$\begin{aligned} T &:= \min\{t_1, t_0 + (\log 2)/2a\} \\ R(r) &:= \min\{r, (\log 2)/2a\}, \quad r \geq 0 \\ t_u &:= \min\{t \geq t_0 \mid \Lambda(t - t_0, u) = \|x^0\|/2\}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

Then

$$J(t_1; t_0, x^0, u) \geq J(T; t_0, x^0, u) \stackrel{(3.5)}{\geq} \int_{t_0}^{\min\{T, t_u\}} \left[\frac{1}{4} \|x^0\|^2 + \|u(\tau)\|^2 \right] d\tau.$$

We will now derive a lower bound for the expression on the right hand side and consider two cases:

(i) If $u \in L^2([t_0, t_1])$ is such that $t_u \geq T$ we have

$$J(T; t_0, x^0, u) \geq \frac{T - t_0}{4} \|x^0\|^2 = \frac{R(t_1 - t_0)}{4} \|x^0\|^2. \quad (3.7)$$

(ii) If $t_u < T$, then $\Lambda(t_u - t_0, u) = \frac{1}{2} \|x^0\|$ yields

$$\|u\|_{L^2(t_0, t_u)}^2 \stackrel{(3.5)}{=} \left(\frac{e^{-a[t_u - t_0]} - \frac{1}{2}}{b \|e^{a\cdot}\|_{L^1(0, t_u - t_0)}} \right)^2 \|x^0\|^2 \stackrel{(3.6)}{\geq} \frac{\left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{1}{2}\right)^2}{b^2 \|e^{a\cdot}\|_{L^1(0, T - t_0)}^2} \|x^0\|^2. \quad (3.8)$$

we obtain from (3.7), and (3.8) that for all $u \in L^2([t_0, t_1]; \mathbb{R}^m)$, $x^0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$

$$J(t; t_0, x^0, u) \geq \min \left\{ \frac{R(t_1 - t_0)}{4}, \frac{\left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{1}{2}\right)^2}{b^2 \|e^{a\cdot}\|_{L^1(0, R(t_1 - t_0))}^2} \right\} \|x^0\|^2 =: \gamma(t_1 - t_0) \|x^0\|^2.$$

This proves the lower bound of the claim.

Suppose Assumption (A1) holds. For u given as in Assumption (A1) we conclude, for all $t \in [t_0, t_1]$ and all $x^0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\begin{aligned} (x^0)^\top P(t; t_1, t_0) x^0 &\stackrel{(2.9)}{=} V(t_1; t, x^0) \stackrel{(2.7)}{\leq} J(t_1; t, x^0, u) \\ &\leq J(\infty; t, x^0, u) \stackrel{(A1)}{\leq} C(t) \|x^0\|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

which proves the upper bound of the claim.

(3.1) \Rightarrow (3.2) : Fix $t_0 \geq 0$. Then we have, by Proposition 3.9 for all $x^0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\gamma(t_1 - t_0) \|x^0\|^2 \stackrel{(3.1)}{\leq} (x^0)^\top P(t; t_1, t_0) x^0 \stackrel{(2.9)}{=} V(t_1; t, x^0) \stackrel{(3.1)}{\leq} C(t) \|x^0\|^2;$$

and therefore, since $P(t; \cdot, t_0)$ is monotonically non-decreasing by Theorem 2.1 (iv), we conclude existence, positive definiteness, and symmetry of

$$\Pi(t, t_0) := \lim_{t_1 \rightarrow \infty} P(t; t_1, t_0).$$

As the monotone limit of solutions of (2.8), $\Pi(\cdot, t_0)$ solves the Riccati equation (2.8) with initial condition $\Pi(t_0, t_0) = \lim_{t_1 \rightarrow \infty} P(t_0; t_1, t_0)$. Finally, uniqueness follows from standard theorems on ordinary differential equations.

(3.2) \Rightarrow (3.3) : We now consider the closed-loop system

$$\dot{x} = [A(t) - B(t)B(t)^\top \Pi(t, 0)] x \quad (3.10)$$

on $[0, \infty)$. The derivative of the Lyapunov function $x(t)^\top \Pi(t, 0)x(t)$ along any solution $x(\cdot)$ of (3.10) satisfies, for all $t \geq 0$

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{dt} (x(t)^\top \Pi(t, 0)x(t)) \\ &= x(t)^\top [A(t)^\top \Pi(t, 0) + \Pi(t, 0)A(t) - 2\Pi(t, 0)B(t)B(t)^\top \Pi(t, 0) + \frac{d}{dt} \Pi(t, 0)] x(t) \\ &\stackrel{(2.8)}{=} x(t)^\top [-I_n - \Pi(t, 0)B(t)B(t)^\top \Pi(t, 0)] x(t), \end{aligned}$$

and integration of the latter over $[0, t_1]$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} -x(0)^\top \Pi(0, 0)x(0) &\leq x(t_1)^\top \Pi(t_1, 0)x(t_1) - x(0)^\top \Pi(0, 0)x(0) \\ &= -\int_0^{t_1} [\|x(\tau)\|^2 + \|B(\tau)^\top \Pi(\tau, 0)x(\tau)\|^2] d\tau \leq -\int_0^{t_1} \|x(\tau)\|^2 d\tau \end{aligned}$$

and similarly $x(0)^\top \Pi(0, 0)x(0) \geq \|u\|_{L^2(0, t_1)}$.

Since the above two inequalities hold true for all $t_1 \geq 0$, it follows that $x(\cdot) \in L^2([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}^n)$ and $u(\cdot) \in L^2([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}^m)$. As $A(\cdot)$ and $B(\cdot)$ are essentially bounded by assumption, it follows that

$$\dot{x}(\cdot) = [A(\cdot)x(\cdot) + B(\cdot)u(\cdot)] \in L^2([0, \infty), \mathbb{R}^n).$$

Hence, $x(\cdot)$ is an L^2 -function with derivative in L^2 and we may apply [7, Lemma 2.3.9] to conclude that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} x(t) = 0$.

If $(t_0, x^0) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}^n$ and $x(\cdot; t_0, x^0)$ is the unique solution to

$$\dot{x} = [A(t) - B(t)B(t)^\top \Pi(t, 0)]x, \quad x(t_0) = x^0,$$

then $x(\cdot; t_0, x^0) = x(\cdot; 0, x(0; t_0, x^0))$ and by the previous findings it follows that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} x(t; t_0, x^0) = 0$. Hence the closed-loop system is attractive; and for linear systems this implies asymptotic stability, see [7, Prop. 3.3.2]. Finally, we have $B(\cdot)^\top \Pi(\cdot) \in L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; \mathbb{R}^{m \times n})$ as $B(\cdot)$ is essentially bounded and $\Pi(\cdot)$ is continuous.

This completes the proof of the theorem. \square

We note the following immediate corollary.

Corollary 3.4. *If system (1.1) given by $(A(\cdot), B(\cdot))$ is such that for some $\lambda > 0$ the shifted system $(A(\cdot) - \lambda I, B(\cdot))$ satisfies (A1), then (1.1) is exponentially stabilizable by locally bounded feedback.*

Proof. By Theorem 3.2 there exists an asymptotically stabilizing feedback F for $(A(\cdot) - \lambda I, B(\cdot))$. Hence, $k_L(A - \lambda I + BF) \leq 0$ and so $k_L(A + BF) \leq -\lambda$. \square

Remark 3.5. Note that in Theorem 3.2 it cannot be expected that the closed-loop system in (3.3) has a negative Lyapunov exponent: consider $\dot{x} = \frac{-1}{1+t}x$, which clearly satisfies (A1) but $k_L(A - BB^\top P) < 0$ is not the case.

Also, it is not necessary that (A1) holds in order that a system is stabilizable, as in general, asymptotically stable linear time-varying systems need not have trajectories that are square integrable. An example in point is $\dot{x} = \frac{-1}{2(1+t)}x$, which has solutions $x(t; x_0, t_0) = \sqrt{(t_0 + 1)/(t + 1)}x(t_0)$ for $t \geq t_0 \geq 0$.

The much stronger condition of arbitrarily assigning the Lyapunov exponent by state feedback is equivalent to complete controllability and treated, by invoking Theorem 3.2, in the next main result.

Theorem 3.6. *System (1.1) is completely controllable if, and only if, for all $\lambda > 0$ there exists an $F \in L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; \mathbb{R}^{m \times n})$ such that $k_L(A + BF) \leq -\lambda$. Both conditions imply (A1); and (A1) does not, in general, imply complete controllability of (1.1).*

Proof. We proceed in several steps.

Step 1: We show that completely controllability implies (A1): Choose, for initial data (t_0, x^0) , a $t_1 \geq t_0$ and $u(\cdot)$ such that $x(t_1; t_0, x^0, u) = 0$. Define

$$\tilde{u}(t) := \begin{cases} u(t), & t \in [t_0, t_1) \\ 0, & t \geq t_1 \end{cases} \quad (3.11)$$

Then $x(t; t_0, x^0, u) = 0$ for $t \geq t_1$, and so $J(\infty; t_0, x^0, \tilde{u}) = J(t_1; t_0, x^0, u) < \infty$. This proves (A1') and the claim follows from Proposition 3.1. The converse of Step 1 is obviously false, as the simple example $\dot{x} = -x$ shows.

Step 2: Assume that (1.1) is complete controllable and note that by (2.2) this is true if, and only if, $(A + \lambda I, B)$ is completely controllable for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. Fix $\lambda > 0$. Then Step 1 applied to Theorem 3.2 yields the existence of some $F \in L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; \mathbb{R}^{m \times n})$ such that $k_L(A + \lambda I + BF) \leq 0$. Now it is straightforward to see that $k_L(A + BF) \leq -\lambda$.

Step 3: Finally, assume that for every $\lambda < 0$ we may achieve $k_L(A + BF) \leq -\lambda$. We have, by definition of $W(\cdot, \cdot)$,

$$\forall 0 \leq t_0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 : \ker W(t_0, t_2) \subset \ker W(t_0, t_1),$$

and since $\ker W(t_0, t)$ is a finite dimensional space, it is easily verified that

$$(1.1) \text{ is not completely controllable} \Leftrightarrow \exists t_0 \geq 0 : \bigcap_{t \geq t_0} \ker W(t_0, t) \neq \{0\}.$$

Now assume that (1.1) is not completely controllable and

$$\text{choose } t_0 \geq 0 \text{ and } x^0 \in \bigcap_{t \geq t_0} \ker W(t_0, t) \text{ such that } \|x^0\| = 1.$$

Let $F(\cdot) \in L^\infty([t_0, \infty), \mathbb{R}^{m \times n})$ be arbitrary and set $u(\cdot) := F(\cdot)\Phi_{A+BF}(\cdot, t_0)x^0$ and $z(\cdot) := \int_{t_0}^\cdot \Phi_A(t_0, s)B(s)u(s)ds$. Then the unique solution $x_F(\cdot)$ of

$$\dot{x} = [A + BF]x, \quad x(t_0) = x^0$$

satisfies by variation of constants that

$$x_F(t) = \Phi_A(t, t_0)x^0 + \int_{t_0}^t \Phi_A(t, s)B(s)u(s)ds = \Phi_A(t, t_0)[x^0 + z(t)]. \quad (3.12)$$

We now use the well-known fact, [15, Hilfssatz 3.1], that for all $t \geq t_0$ we have $z(t) \in \text{im } W(t_0, t)$ and briefly summarize the arguments provided in [15] for the veracity of that claim:

It is clear that $\text{im } W(t_0, t) \subset \mathcal{R} := \{\int_{t_0}^t \Phi_A(t_0, s)B(s)u(s)ds | u(\cdot) \in L^1(t_0, t)\}$. As $W(t, t_0)$ is symmetric, it follows that equality holds if, and only if, $\ker W(t_0, t) \cap \mathcal{R} = \{0\}$. Now $x \in \ker W(t_0, t)$ if, and only if, $B^*(s)\Phi_A(t_0, s)^*x = 0$ almost everywhere on $[t_0, t]$. So if $x \in \ker W(t_0, t) \cap \mathcal{R}$, we have

$$\|x\|^2 = x^*x = \int_{t_0}^t x^*\Phi_A(t_0, s)B(s)u(s)ds = 0,$$

and this proves the claim.

Continuing with the proof, note that since $x^0 \in \ker W(t_0, t)$ for all $t \geq t_0$ and $W(t_0, t)$ is diagonalizable by orthogonal transformation, we conclude

$$\forall t \geq t_0 : \|x^0 + z(t)\| = \sqrt{\|x^0\|^2 + \|z(t)\|^2} = \sqrt{1 + \|z(t)\|^2}. \quad (3.13)$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} k_L(A + BF) &\stackrel{(3.12)}{\geq} \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \|\Phi_A(t, t_0) (x^0 + z(t))\| \\ &\geq \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \left(\|\Phi_A(t_0, t)\|^{-1} \sqrt{1 + \|z(t)\|^2} \right) \\ &= \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \left(\log \|\Phi_A(t_0, t)\|^{-1} + \frac{1}{2} \log (1 + \|z(t)\|^2) \right) \\ &\geq \limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log \|\Phi_A(t_0, t)\|^{-1} \stackrel{(3.4)}{\geq} -\|A\|_\infty, \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality is a consequence of the definition of the Lyapunov exponent and the last inequality uses [7, Lemma 3.3.4 and Remark 3.3.11].

It follows that without the assumption of complete controllability it is not possible to assign arbitrarily negative Lyapunov exponents. \square

We conclude this section with an example showing that various implications between controllability, stabilizability by bounded feedback, and existence of positive and bounded solutions of the Riccati equation (2.8) cannot be expected.

Example 3.7. Consider the example

$$\dot{x}(t) = x(t) + \frac{1}{t+1} u(t), \quad t \geq 0. \quad (3.14)$$

(1) First note that the system (3.14) is completely controllable by immediate calculation. This implies that (A1') is satisfied, because we can steer any initial condition (t_0, x^0) to the origin. By Proposition 3.1, (A1) holds.

(2) Next we show that the system (3.14) cannot be expected to be stabilizable by a bounded feedback. Let $u(\cdot) = f(\cdot)x(\cdot)$ and suppose that $f(\cdot)$ is bounded. Then $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} a(t) + b(t)f(t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} 1 + \frac{f(t)}{t+1} = 1$ and hence the closed-loop system satisfies, for large t , $\dot{x}(t) = [a(t) + b(t)f(t)]x(t) \geq x(t)/2$, and so it is unstable and, in particular, the feedback is not stabilizing.

(3) It is easy to see that the associated control Riccati equation (2.8), i.e.

$$\dot{p}(t) + 2p(t) - \frac{1}{(t+1)^2} p(t)^2 + 1 = 0$$

to the system (3.14) does not have any positive bounded solution.

(4) In particular, system (3.14) provides a counterexample to [6, Theorem 3.1] where the authors claim the equivalence of (i) “global null-controllability”, (ii) the existence of a bounded positive solution to the associated control Riccati equation, and (iii) the possibility of assigning arbitrary Lyapunov exponents by bounded feedback. We have seen that complete controllability holds for the present example. This yields (i); however, (ii) and (iii) fail.

Example 3.8. In this example we show that it may be possible to assign arbitrary Lyapunov exponents by bounded feedback without the possibility of uniform exponential stabilization. To this end, let $T_0 := 0$, $T_{k+1} := T_k + 2k = k(k+1)$, $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and consider $\dot{x} = x + b(t)u(t)$ for

$$b(t) = \begin{cases} 1 & , \quad t \in [T_k, T_k + k) \\ 0 & , \quad t \in [T_k + k, T_k + 2k) \end{cases}.$$

So any feedback $u(t) = f(t)x(t)$ with $f \in L_{\text{loc}}^\infty(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; \mathbb{R})$ we have

$$\forall k \in \mathbb{N} : \Phi_f(T_{k+1}, T_k + k) = \exp \int_{T_k + k}^{T_{k+1}} [a(\tau) + b(\tau)f(\tau)] d\tau = e^k$$

and therefore it is impossible to find a uniform constant $M \geq 0$ and $\lambda < 1$ such that, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we have $|\Phi_f(T_{k+1}, T_k + k)| = e^k \leq Me^{\lambda k}$. This shows that the Bohl exponent of the closed-loop system is at least equal to 1.

On the other hand, it is easy to see that with the choice of $f(\cdot) = -1 - 2\lambda$ for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, the closed-loop system is $\dot{x} = [1 + b(t)f(t)]x$ and

$$\forall k \in \mathbb{N}_0 : \Phi_f(T_k + 2k, T_k) = e^{(-1-2\lambda)k} e^k = e^{-\lambda 2k}.$$

Now it is easy to derive that the Lyapunov exponent $k_L(1 + b(t)f(t)) = -\lambda$.

3.2. Uniform exponential stabilizability

In view of Theorem 3.2, the reason that the construction of the feedback does not result in a bounded stabilizing feedback lies in the specific t_0 dependence of the bound $C(t_0)$ in (A1). Indeed, in (3.9) we have seen that $\Pi(t)$ is bounded by $C(t)$. It would then seem natural to strengthen (A1) as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(A2)} \quad & \exists C \geq 0 \quad \forall (t_0, x^0) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}^n \quad \exists u \in L^2([t_0, \infty); \mathbb{R}^m) \\ & : J(\infty; t_0, x^0, u) \leq C \|x^0\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

To show the equivalence of (A2) and uniform exponential stabilizability the following uniform bound similar as in (3.1) is needed.

Proposition 3.9. *Consider system (1.1) and suppose that (A2) holds. Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \exists \text{ a function } \gamma : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty) \forall 0 \leq t_0 < t_1 \leq \infty \forall x^0 \in \mathbb{R}^n \\ : \gamma(t_1 - t_0) \|x^0\|^2 \leq V(t_1; t_0, x^0) \leq C \|x^0\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof of (3.1) and omitted. \square

We are now in a position to show that (A2) is equivalent to uniform exponential stabilizability.

Theorem 3.10. *For any system (1.1) we have:*

$$(A2) \iff (1.1) \text{ is uniformly exponentially stabilizable by bounded feedback.}$$

Proof. Denote, for $(t_0, x^0) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}^n$, the unique solution of the initial value problem $\dot{x} = [A + BF]x$, $x(t_0) = x^0$, by $x_F(\cdot; t_0, x^0) : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ and set

$$u(\cdot) = F(\cdot) x_F(\cdot; t_0, x^0).$$

If (2.1) is valid, then

$$\exists M \geq 1 \exists \beta > 0 \forall (t_0, x^0) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}^n \forall t \geq t_0 : \|x_F(t; t_0, x^0)\| \leq M e^{-\beta(t-t_0)} \|x^0\|,$$

and therefore, $\|u(t)\| \leq \|F\|_{L^\infty(0, \infty)} M e^{-\beta(t-t_0)} \|x^0\|$, and (A2) clearly holds.

Suppose (A2) holds. Define $F(t) = -B(t)^\top \Pi(t, 0)$. As

$$\Pi(t, 0) = \lim_{t_1 \rightarrow \infty} P(t; t_1, 0) \geq P(t; t+1, 0),$$

it follows from (A2) and with $\alpha := \gamma(1)$, as given by Proposition 3.9, that

$$\forall t \geq 0 : \alpha I_n \leq \Pi(t, 0) \leq C I_n. \quad (3.16)$$

This shows that $F \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; \mathbb{R}^{m \times n})$.

Following the calculations in the proof of (3.2), we see that the derivative of the Lyapunov function $x(t)^\top \Pi(t, 0)x(t)$ along any solution $x(\cdot)$ of (3.10) satisfies, for all $t \geq 0$,

$$\frac{d}{dt} (x(t)^\top \Pi(t, 0)x(t)) \leq -\|x(t)\|^2 \stackrel{(3.16)}{\leq} -\frac{1}{C} (x(t)^\top \Pi(t, 0)x(t))$$

and integration of the latter over $[t_0, t]$ yields for all $t \geq t_0$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \|x(t)\|^2 &\stackrel{(3.16)}{\leq} \frac{1}{\alpha} x(t)^\top \Pi(t, 0)x(t) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\alpha} e^{-(t-t_0)/C} x(t_0)^\top \Pi(t_0, 0)x(t_0) \stackrel{(3.16)}{\leq} \frac{C}{\alpha} e^{-(t-t_0)/C} \|x(t_0)\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

This shows uniform exponential stability of $\dot{x} = [A + BF]x$, whence (2.1). Therefore, the proof of the theorem is complete. \square

Remark 3.11. There are some results known for the case that $(A(\cdot), B(\cdot))$ are unbounded and we briefly comment on these.

(i) If boundedness is not assumed, it is still true that uniform controllability, as defined in [9, Def. (5.13)], see also [1], implies that arbitrary Bohl exponents may be assigned. The converse has no hope of being true, as in the unbounded case a system without inputs can have Bohl exponent equal to $-\infty$, so the property that the Bohl exponent is below any real bound does not really say much about the system. A further example may be found in [1, Example 3].

(ii) Again in the case of unbounded $(A(\cdot), B(\cdot))$, a characterization of complete controllability is possible using the concept of *complete stabilizability* as introduced in [1]. The latter property is satisfied if arbitrary varying exponential decay rates can be achieved by feedback. More precisely, it is required that for any continuous function $(t, t_0) \mapsto \delta(t, t_0)$ there exists a feedback F and constants $a(t_0), t_0 \geq 0$ such that the closed-loop system satisfies

$$\|\Phi_F(t, t_0)\| \leq a(t_0) e^{-\delta(t, t_0)}, \quad \forall t \geq t_0.$$

Ikeda et al. [1] prove for possibly unbounded $(A(\cdot), B(\cdot))$ that system (1.1) is completely controllable if, and only if, it is completely stabilizable.

We now derive a sufficient condition for (A2) that is related to ‘uniform stabilizability’ as introduced in [16] for the discrete-time case to show the existence of a uniformly exponentially stabilizing feedback. The condition below is a slight modification of this and also interpreted for continuous time systems. Loosely speaking, condition (3.17) says that, if on a given interval a trajectory is not decaying, then it is possible to control the system sufficiently. Consider

$$\begin{aligned} \exists T \geq S > 0 \quad \exists d \in [0, 1) \quad \exists c > 0 \quad \forall t \geq 0 \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \\ \|\Phi_A(t+T, t)x\| \geq d\|x\| \quad \Rightarrow \quad x^\top W(t, t+S)x \geq b\|x\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

Proposition 3.12. (3.17) *implies* (A2).

Proof. For reasons of space, we only give an outline. Suppose that (3.17) holds for given constants S, T, d, c . As $S \leq T$ by assumption, we have $W(t, t+S) \preceq W(t, t+T)$, and thus we may assume that $S = T$.

Fix $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $t_0 \geq 0$ and define $t_k = t_0 + kT$ for $k = 0, 1, \dots$. For each k we choose an orthogonal transformation $T(k)$ such that

$$T(k)^\top W(t_k, t_{k+1}) T(k) = \begin{bmatrix} V_1(k) & 0 \\ 0 & V_2(k) \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad V_1(k) \succeq cI, \quad V_2(k) \prec cI,$$

with $0 \leq \dim V_1(k) = n - \dim V_2(k) \leq n$. Then it may be shown, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Phi_A(t_{k+1}, t_k) x(t_k)\| &\geq d \|x(t_k)\| \implies \\ \|\Phi_A(t_{k+1}, t_k) (T(k) \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix} T(k)^\top x(t_k))\| &< d \|x(t_k)\|. \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

Next we design a control $u_k(\cdot)$ on $[t_k, t_{k+1})$ such that

$$\|x(t_{k+1}; x(t_k), t_k, u_k)\| < d \|x(t_k)\|. \quad (3.19)$$

If the presupposition in (3.18) does not hold, then put $u_k \equiv 0$ and (3.19) is trivially satisfied. If the presupposition in (3.18) holds, then put

$$u_k(\tau) = -B(\tau)^\top \Phi_A(t_k, \tau)^\top T(k) \begin{bmatrix} V_1(k)^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} T(k)^\top x(t_k), \quad \tau \in [t_k, t_{k+1})$$

and a straightforward computation using (3.18) shows (3.19).

Now define a control $u : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be stacking together the controls u_k designed for (3.19) and consider the solution $x(\cdot) := x(\cdot; x^0, t_0, u)$. Then the superposition property of linear ordinary differential equations gives

$$\forall k \in \mathbb{N} : \|x(t_{k+1})\| < d^k \|x^0\|. \quad (3.20)$$

From the definition of $u_k(\cdot)$, the boundedness of $A(\cdot)$ and $B(\cdot)$, and as $\|V_1(k)^{-1}\| \leq c^{-1}$ we see that

$$\|u_k\|_{L^\infty(t_k, t_{k+1})} \stackrel{\text{Lem. 3.3}}{\leq} \|B(\cdot)\|_\infty e^{aT} c^{-1} \|x(t_k)\| \stackrel{(3.20)}{<} \|B(\cdot)\|_\infty e^{aT} c^{-1} d^k \|x^0\|, \quad (3.21)$$

and thus a longish but straightforward calculation yields

$$\|u(\cdot)\|_{L^2(0, \infty)}^2 < T \left(\frac{\|B(\cdot)\|_\infty e^{aT}}{c} \right)^2 \frac{1}{1 - d^2} \|x^0\|^2.$$

Similarly,

$$\|x(\cdot)\|_{L^2(0, \infty)}^2 < \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left[3T e^{2aT} \|x(t_k)\|^2 + 3T (T e^{aT} \|B(\cdot)\|_\infty \|u_k\|_{L^\infty(t_k, t_{k+1})})^2 \right]$$

and by (3.20) and (3.21) there exists a constant $\tilde{C} > 0$ such that $\|x(\cdot)\|_{L^2(0, \infty)}^2 \leq \tilde{C} \|x^0\|^2$. This shows (A2). \square

4. Dynamic feedback

In [5] it is shown that if system (1.1) is uniformly exponentially stabilizable by linear dynamic state feedback, then it is uniformly exponentially stabilizable. The proof relies on a clever manipulation of the Lyapunov function of the closed-loop system and is of interest in its own right. Here we are able to give a much shorter and conceptually simpler proof, based on the previous results. Furthermore, we extend the statement to the case of exponential stabilizability.

A dynamic feedback for system (1.1) is given by a system

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{z}(t) &= K(t)z(t) + L(t)x(t), & z(0) &= z^0 \\ u(t) &= M(t)z(t) + N(t)x(t), \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

where $z^0 \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $K \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; \mathbb{R}^{p \times p})$, $L \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; \mathbb{R}^{p \times n})$, $M \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; \mathbb{R}^{m \times p})$, $N \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}; \mathbb{R}^{m \times x})$. This yields the closed-loop system

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{x}(t) &= [A(t) + B(t)N(t)] x(t) + B(t)M(t)z(t), & x(0) &= x^0 \\ \dot{z}(t) &= K(t)z(t) + L(t)x(t), & z(0) &= z^0.\end{aligned}\quad (4.2)$$

Theorem 4.1. *Consider system (1.1).*

- (i) *If there exists a dynamic feedback of the form (4.1) such that the closed-loop (4.2) is uniformly exponentially stable, then (1.1) is uniformly exponentially stabilizable by linear static, time-varying, bounded feedback.*
- (ii) *If there exists a dynamic feedback of the form (4.1) such that the closed-loop (4.2) is exponentially stable, then (1.1) is exponentially stabilizable by linear static, time-varying, possibly unbounded feedback.*

Proof. (i) If the closed-loop system (4.2) is uniformly exponentially stable, then there exist constants $D \geq 1$, $\beta > 0$ such that, for all initial conditions $(t_0, x^0, z^0) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^p$ and for all $t \geq t_0$, we have

$$\|x(t; t_0, x^0, z^0)\|^2 + \|z(t; t_0, x^0, z^0)\|^2 \leq D^2 e^{-2\beta(t-t_0)} (\|x^0\|^2 + \|z^0\|^2). \quad (4.3)$$

We obtain in particular for the choice $z^0 = 0$ a bound only depending on $\|x^0\|$ on the right hand side. Writing

$$u(t) := N(t)x(t; t_0, x^0, 0) + M(t)z(t; t_0, x^0, 0) \quad (4.4)$$

and $\eta = \max\{\|N\|_\infty, \|M\|_\infty\}$ it follows that

$$\forall t \geq 0 : \|u(t)\| \leq \eta D e^{-\beta(t-t_0)} \|x^0\|^2. \quad (4.5)$$

The combination of (4.3) and (4.5) shows that (A2) is satisfied. Now the claim follows from Theorem 3.10.

(ii) If the closed-loop system (4.2) is exponentially stable, there exist constants $D(t_0) \geq 1$, $\beta > 0$ such that, for all initial conditions $(x^0, z^0) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^p$ and for all $t \geq t_0$, we have

$$\|x(t; t_0, x^0, z^0)\|^2 + \|z(t; t_0, x^0, z^0)\|^2 \leq D(t_0)^2 e^{-2\beta(t-t_0)} (\|x^0\|^2 + \|z^0\|^2). \quad (4.6)$$

In particular for $\lambda \in (0, \beta)$, the solution (x_λ, z_λ) of the λ -shifted system

$$\dot{x}(t) = [A(t) + \lambda I + B(t)N(t)] x(t) + B(t)M(t)z(t) \quad (4.7)$$

$$\dot{z}(t) = [K(t) + \lambda I] z(t) + L(t)x(t) \quad (4.8)$$

satisfies

$$\|x_\lambda(t; t_0, x^0, z^0)\|^2 + \|z_\lambda(t; t_0, x^0, z^0)\|^2 \leq D(t_0)^2 e^{-2(\beta-\lambda)(t-t_0)} (\|x^0\|^2 + \|z^0\|^2). \quad (4.9)$$

This shows that the system corresponding to $(A(\cdot) + \lambda I, B(\cdot))$ is exponentially stabilizable by dynamic feedback. A calculation as in (4.4), (4.5) shows that the corresponding input $u_\lambda(\cdot) = N(t)x_\lambda(\cdot) + M(t)z_\lambda(\cdot)$ satisfies

$$\forall t \geq 0 : \|u_\lambda(t)\| \leq \eta D(t_0) e^{-(\beta-\lambda)(t-t_0)} \|x^0\|^2. \quad (4.10)$$

By (4.9) and (4.10) it can be seen that $(A(\cdot) + \lambda I, B(\cdot))$ satisfies (A1'). By Proposition 3.1, (A1) is satisfied, and so by Theorem 3.2 there exists an asymptotically stabilizing static state feedback $F_\lambda(\cdot)$ for this system. It follows that

$$\dot{x}(t) = [A(t) + B(t)F_\lambda(t)]x(t)$$

is exponentially stable with maximal Lyapunov exponent less or equal to $-\lambda$. \square

5. Conclusions

In this paper we have filled some gaps that were present in the stabilizability theory of linear time-varying systems. In particular, for the question of characterizing stabilizability in the case that systems are not completely controllable or completely controllable but not uniformly so, criteria for stabilizability are provided provided.

Bibliography

- [1] M. Ikeda, H. Maeda, S. Kodama, Stabilization of linear systems, SIAM J. Control Optim. 10 (1972) 716–729.
- [2] M. Ikeda, H. Maeda, S. Kodama, Estimation and feedback in linear time-varying systems: a deterministic theory, SIAM J. Control Optim. 13 (1975) 304–326.
- [3] B. D. O. Anderson, J. B. Moore, Linear Optimal Control, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1971.
- [4] R. Ravi, A. M. Pascoal, P. P. Khargonekar, Normalized coprime factorizations for linear time-varying systems, Syst. Control Lett. 18 (6) (1992) 455–465.
- [5] M. A. Rotea, P. P. Khargonekar, Stabilizability of linear time-varying and uncertain linear systems, IEEE Trans. Autom. Control 33 (9) (1988) 884–887.
- [6] V. N. Phat, Q. Ha, New characterization of controllability via stabilizability and Riccati equation for LTV systems, IMA J. Math. Control & Information 25 (4) (2008) 419–429.
- [7] D. Hinrichsen, A. J. Pritchard, Mathematical Systems Theory I. Modelling, State Space Analysis, Stability and Robustness, Vol. 48 of Texts in Applied Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2005.

- [8] J. L. Daleckiĭ, M. G. Kreĭn, Stability of Solutions of Differential Equations in Banach Spaces, no. 43 in Translations of Mathematical Monographs, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1974.
- [9] R. E. Kalman, Contributions to the theory of optimal control, Bol. Soc. Matem. Mexico II. Ser. 5 (1960) 102–119.
- [10] A. Cheng, A direct way to stabilize continuous-time and discrete-time linear time-varying systems, IEEE Trans. Autom. Control AC-24 (4) (1979) 641–643.
- [11] W. J. Rugh, Linear System Theory, 2nd Edition, Information and System Sciences Series, Prentice-Hall, NJ, 1996.
- [12] W. M. Wonham, On pole assignment in multi-input controllable linear systems, IEEE Trans. Autom. Control AC-12 (1967) 660–665.
- [13] E. D. Sontag, Mathematical Control Theory: Deterministic Finite Dimensional Systems, 2nd Edition, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1998.
- [14] G. Weiss, R. Rebarber, Optimizability and estimatability for infinite-dimensional linear systems, SIAM J. Control Optim. 39 (4) (2000) 1204–1232.
- [15] H. W. Knobloch, H. Kwakernaak, Lineare Kontrolltheorie, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1985.
- [16] B. D. Anderson, J. B. Moore, Detectability and stabilizability of time-varying discrete-time linear systems, SIAM J. Control Optim. 19 (1) (1981) 20–32.